SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" With reference to clause (a), may I know who are the approved national leaders and whether the list includes the names of any living persons? "

THE HON. SRI K. RAJARAM :—" A separate question may be put, Sir."

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—" Is there any proposal to install the portraits of national leaders in the Art Gallery in this State? "

THE HON. SRI K. RAJARAM :—" A separate question may be put."

Appointment of Special Magistrates for trial of prohibition cases.

* 10 Q.—SRI M. ETHIRAJULU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposal to appoint Special Magistrates for trial of prohibition cases in this State?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" There is no such general proposal, but in the past Government have appointed some Magistrates exclusively for the trial of prohibition cases in a few districts to reduce the pendency of such cases."

SRI M. ETHIRAJULU :—" As the trial of prohibition cases now being conducted by the ordinary Magistrates along with the other cases has proved to be a farce because of the fact that prohibition cases are taken only in late hours when the witnesses are not generally expected to wait, a day long, may I request the Hon. Minister to reconsider the question of appointing Special Magistrates or to instruct the Magistrates to take up prohibition cases prior to other cases? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" The suggestion will be considered."

SRI K. BHASHYAM :—" Will the Hon. the Minister for Law take care to see that the Magistrates who try prohibition cases do themselves believe in prohibition and that the Government do not appoint persons who do not believe in prohibition or who are at least indifferent about it? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" We cannot interfere with the judicial activities of Magistrates, much less can we interfere with their private activities."

SRI K. BHASHYAM :—" Deciding prohibition cases is not a private activity. It is a public duty."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Will this policy be applied to the trial of the other cases also? Supposing there is a zamindar-tenant case, should the trying Magistrate be one who believes in that particular legislation? "

[28th December 1953

SRI K. BHASHYAM :—" He must be one who believes in the payment of rent regularly."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The hon. Member should think for a moment whether we are considering the procedure at the trial when the case goes on or whether we are considering the appointment of the Magistrates concerned. I think that we are putting unnecessary questions without grasping the real difficulties involved."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" What is the average number of prohibition cases in a month in the State and is it increasing or decreasing? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put, Sir."

III.—PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE *RE* PRESENTATION OF BUDGET.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—" Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a point affecting the privilege of this House, namely, the presentation of the Budget here 15 days after it has been presented in the other House. Article 202 (1) of the Constitution lays down that the ' Governor shall in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before both the Houses of Legislature a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure for the year.' The Budget should have been, I contend, presented in both the Houses simultaneously."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" There is no mention of the word ' simultaneous ' in the Article."

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—" It has been the convention so far, that the Budget should be presented to both the Houses at least within a few hours on the same day. This question was raised in this House when Sri R. B. Ramakrishna Raju was in the Chair and I find in the proceedings that on behalf of the Government an assurance was given that not only the annual statement of expenditure but also the supplementary financial statements would be presented to both Houses on the same day. As it is, the Budget is presented in this House after it has gone through all the stages in the other House. If the Budget discussion had been held in this House at least before the voting on Demands for Grants in the other House, the Government as well as the Members of the Assembly would have had an opportunity to have the views of this House while disposing of the Budget demands and to a certain extent could have shaped their policies. Now I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going through the formality of presenting the Budget and discussing it in this House. I have raised this question, Sir, to bring to your notice and to the notice of the Leader of the House that the privileges of this House should be safeguarded and that this should not, in any case, be made a precedent for the future."